

Claims 16-37 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 16 February 2010.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsien et al. in view of McWherter et al. for reasons of record set forth in the previous Office Actions.

At page 9 and at the top of page 10 of the remarks filed 13 February 2012, Applicants point out that Tsien et al. teaches a change in fluorescence, whereas the claimed invention utilizes output signals other than fluorescence. This was noted in the non-final Office Action mailed 19 January 2011, and as set forth in that Office Action, the teachings of McWherter et al.

Art Unit: 1636

provides the teachings to cover this difference and render the claimed invention obvious, as set forth in that Office Action.

Applicants then argue that McWherter et al. does not teach a modulatable fusion protein, because they output signal is alleged not to be influenced by the input signal. Applicants state that “[t]his stabilization is not dependant [sic] on any input signal, it is merely a constitutive aspect of the structure of the fusion protein.” However, the stabilization resulting from binding of the first agonist and the subsequent effects thereof represent the output signal, and as such, the fusion protein is modulatable. Without the input signal, the output signal would not occur.

This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/588,114. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however,

Art Unit: 1636

event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Ketter whose telephone number is 571-272-0770. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSK
21 February 2012

/James S. Ketter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636